



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,107	06/27/2001	Shinji Kawamoto	10873.760US01	4882
23552	7590	12/01/2004	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			PIZIALI, ANDREW T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	
DATE MAILED: 12/01/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/893,107

Applicant(s)

KAWAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew T Piziali

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 28-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-30 and 32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 11/1/2004 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

2. Newly submitted claim 32 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reason: The applicant originally claimed that the film thickness changes continuously (see claim 3).
3. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 32 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 4,786,784 to Nikodem et al. (hereinafter referred to as Nikodem) in view of USPN 6,670,581 to Degand et al. (hereinafter referred to as Degand) in view of USPN 3,982,092 to Marriott.

Regarding claims 1-6 and 31, Nikodem discloses a window glass for a vehicle comprising a glass sheet and a transparent conductive film and a pair of bus bars for feeding power to the transparent conductive film, the bus bars including a longer bus bar and a shorter

Art Unit: 1771

bus bar, the transparent conductive film and the bus bars being formed on the glass sheet (see entire document including the abstract, column 5, line 32 through column 6, line 29 and Figure 1).

Degand discloses that it is known in the art that the temperatures at different portions of a heated window vary from one location to another based on the nature of the conductive film and the electrical voltage difference between the two bus bars (see entire document including column 2, lines 13-23). Marriott discloses that it is known in the art to vary the thickness of the conductive film in select areas of a vehicle window to vary the relative temperatures at different portions of the window (column 6, lines 7-24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the thickness of the conductive film of Nikodem, as taught by Marriott, such that the heat generated by the conductive film is more uniform than heat generated by a conductive film with a uniform surface resistance, and such that the heat generated by the conductive film is less than 1500 W/m^2 , because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the conductive layer thicknesses in select areas of the film determine the temperature of the select areas of the film, as well as the total heat generated by the conductive film, and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claim 4, Nikodem discloses that the window glass may comprise at least two glass sheets and a thermoplastic resin film for bonding the glass sheets and the conductive film and bus bars are provided on the surface of one of the glass sheets (abstract and column 7, lines 28-44).

Regarding claim 5, both Nikodem (column 6, lines 18-29) and Degand (paragraph

Art Unit: 1771

bridging columns 2 and 3) disclose that the conductive film may comprise a metal oxide film, a silver layer and a second metal oxide layer. Nikodem does not specifically mention a five layer conductive film, but Degand discloses that it is known in the art that alternating layers of metal oxide and Ag may be repeated as desired to reach the desired selectivity (paragraph bridging columns 2 and 3). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a five layer conductive film, as taught by Degand, rather than the three layer conductive film disclosed by Nikodem, because a five layer film increases the selectivity of the glazing more than a comparable three layer film which is desirable in some vehicular window glass applications.

Regarding claim 6, Nikodem discloses that a ceramic mask may be provided at a portion where the bus bars are formed (abstract and column 5, lines 32-60).

6. Claims 1-6 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 4,786,784 to Nikodem in view of USPN 6,670,581 to Degand in view of USPN 5,390,595 to Cutcher.

Regarding claims 1-6 and 31, Nikodem discloses a window glass for a vehicle comprising a glass sheet and a transparent conductive film and a pair of bus bars for feeding power to the transparent conductive film, the bus bars including a longer bus bar and a shorter bus bar, the transparent conductive film and the bus bars being formed on the glass sheet (see entire document including the abstract, column 5, line 32 through column 6, line 29 and Figure 1).

Degand discloses that it is known in the art that the temperatures at different portions of a heated window vary from one location to another based on the nature of the conductive film and

Art Unit: 1771

the electrical voltage difference between the two bus bars (see entire document including column 2, lines 13-23). Cutcher discloses that it is known in the art to vary the thickness of the conductive film in select areas of a vehicle window to vary the relative temperatures at different portions of the window (column 1, lines 40-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the thickness of the conductive film of Nikodem, as taught by Cutcher, such that the heat generated by the conductive film is more uniform than heat generated by a conductive film with a uniform surface resistance, and such that the heat generated by the conductive film is less than 1500 W/m^2 , because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the conductive layer thicknesses in select areas of the film determine the temperature of the select areas of the film, as well as the total heat generated by the conductive film, and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claim 4, Nikodem discloses that the window glass may comprise at least two glass sheets and a thermoplastic resin film for bonding the glass sheets and the conductive film and bus bars are provided on the surface of one of the glass sheets (abstract and column 7, lines 28-44).

Regarding claim 5, both Nikodem (column 6, lines 18-29) and Degand (paragraph bridging columns 2 and 3) disclose that the conductive film may comprise a metal oxide film, a silver layer and a second metal oxide layer. Nikodem does not specifically mention a five layer conductive film, but Degand discloses that it is known in the art that alternating layers of metal oxide and Ag may be repeated as desired to reach the desired selectivity (paragraph bridging columns 2 and 3). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 1771

the invention was made to use a five layer conductive film, as taught by Degand, rather than the three layer conductive film disclosed by Nikodem, because a five layer film increases the selectivity of the glazing more than a comparable three layer film which is desirable in some vehicular window glass applications.

Regarding claim 6, Nikodem discloses that a ceramic mask may be provided at a portion where the bus bars are formed (abstract and column 5, lines 32-60).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 11/1/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant asserts that the prior art does not teach or suggest varying the surface resistance of a conductive film so that it decreases from the longer bus bar toward the shorter bus bar. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Degand discloses that it is known in the art that temperatures at different portions of a heated windshield (with or without a data transmission window) undesirably vary from one location to another (see entire document including column 1, line 66 through column 2, line 31 and Figures 1-2). Degand discloses that such a variation is undesirable because some portions of the windshield take longer to de-mist or de-ice, local overheating may damage or even burn the heatable coating layer and/or an adjacent pvb layer, and because local overheating could cause burns to somebody touching it (column 2, lines 24-45).

Figures 1 and 2 of Degand show that one skilled in the art is clearly capable of mapping out the temperature distribution of a windshield. Therefore, only routine experimentation is necessary to determine that more heat is continuously generated in the direction of the shorter

bus bar of Nikodem. Considering that Marriott and Cutcher each disclose that it is known in the art to vary the thickness of a conductive film in select areas of a vehicle window to vary the relative temperatures at different portions of the window (column 6, lines 7-24 of Marriott and column 1, lines 40-47 of Cutcher), it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to continuously vary the thickness of the conductive film of Nikodem, such that the heat generated by the conductive film is more uniform than heat generated by a conductive film with a uniform surface resistance. Such a modification would have been motivated by a desire to eliminate portions of the windshield that take longer to demist or de-ice, to eliminate local overheating that may damage or even burn the heatable coating layer and/or an adjacent pvb layer, and to eliminate local overheating that could cause burns to somebody touching it (column 2, lines 24-45).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-1541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

atp

g-p 11/26/04
ANDREW T. PIZIALI
PATENT EXAMINER

Terrel Morris
TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700